

# THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVATORY.

---

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1847.

No. 6.

---

## THIRD LETTER TO REV. CHARLES BEECHER.

MY DEAR BROTHER, — I propose, in this concluding letter, to inquire, Whether there is any just ground for your apprehension that an apostacy from the Bible is stealing into the Protestant Churches of this land, through the use of creeds ?

You say : “ It has arisen, and is advancing, in the same mysterious, stealthy way, out of the midst of good men and good motives, that saint-worship arose, and every feature of the Romish Apostacy.” “ Our best, most humble, most devoted servants of Christ, are fostering in their midst what will one day, not long hence, show itself to be of the spawn of the dragon. They shrink from any rude word against creeds, with the same sensitiveness with which those holy Fathers would have shrunk from a rude word against the veneration of saints and martyrs, which they were fostering.”

One would suppose, from this, that the subject of creeds had never fully arrested the attention of leading minds in the Protestant Churches of our land, and had never been fully and thoroughly discussed. Nothing can be more contrary to facts. The American Evangelical Churches have not slumbered over the subject ; nor has the creed-power stolen in among them unawares. To a certain kind of assault on creeds they have been sensitive, and justly so ; for it springs, as I have shown, from a dislike of the truth, and tends to infidelity.

But against such abuse of creeds as exists in the Romish Church, or in State Churches, there has been, and still is, a deep and determined feeling of hostility. And although, in some

denominations, creeds are still unduly exalted, yet I do not think that the prevailing tendency of the age is to augment the power of denominational creeds, but the reverse.

I cannot but feel that your theory of prophetic interpretation has, to some extent, been your guide in making out your views of the coming apostacy, rather than a careful and discriminating study of facts. This theory leads you to expect that some terrible development of apostacy, through the creed-power, is near at hand, just before the personal coming of the Lord.

You say : " Oh, remember, the final form of the apostacy shall rise, not by Rome's aggressive march ; not by the Pope's long arm, outstretched to snatch our Bible ; not by crosses, processions, baubles. We understand all that. Apostacy never comes on the outside. It *developes*. It is an apostacy that shall spring to life within us." I am aware that, of the Millenarian interpreters, some think that the man of sin, spoken of by Paul to the Thessalonians, is not the Romish Church, but is something to be developed just before the coming of our Lord. Such expect that all things are to wax worse and worse in the Protestant world, till the Lord comes. The following views, expressed by you, seem to be of the same kind : " Dimly does every one now and then see that things are going wrong. With sighs does every true heart confess that rottenness is somewhere ; but ah, it is hopeless of reform. We all pass on, and the tide rolls down to night." " Thunders mutter in the distance. Winds moan across the surging bosom of the deep. All things betide the rising of that final storm of indignation, which shall sweep away the vain refuges of lies."

It is always dangerous to allow a theory of prophecy to bias the mind in the study or perception of facts. I have already shown that facts do not correspond with your allegations. At least, the Congregationalists and the Baptists are, in no sense, even on your own principles, involved in the charge of apostacy. Nor is there, at this time, any peculiar tendency to give ascendancy to what you call the creed-power. On the other hand, the tendency is in the opposite direction.

The freedom from the undue power of creeds, which naturally springs from the Congregational system, is gradually spreading itself through all other denominations, although they still retain their confessions of faith. To understand this statement, it is



important to consider the uses which have been made of creeds, in the different modes of church organization and government.

The leading modes of organization are, 1, A universal and exclusive church; 2, A national or state church; 3, A hierarchal denominational church; 4, Congregational churches. Let us look at the use of creeds in each of these modes.

1. There is the creed of a professed, universal, infallible, exclusive church; the profession of which is declared to be essential to salvation. Its essential theory forbids private judgment of the Bible, and is to be confounded with no other theory of a creed. Such a creed is not for a nation, but for the whole human race. It does not spring from a civil power, but can exist entirely independent of it, as it does in this country. It admits of no rival, of no appeal, and of no reasoning. Absolute, unreasoning submission is its lowest demand. It does not say, If you reject me, and yet receive the Bible, and believe fundamental truth enough to regenerate the soul, you shall be saved. But it says, Submit to me, and to me alone, or be lost. Now, between this and all Protestant creeds there is a great gulf fixed. Orthodox Protestant creeds do not make obedience to a particular corporation, but regeneration and faith in Christ, essential to salvation; one to remove the pollution of sin, the other its penalty. They teach that the regenerated man, who trusts in Christ, shall be saved, let him be where he may,—in the Church of Rome, or out of it. These same creeds all agree in teaching the doctrines on which regeneration and pardon depend, such as human depravity, the atonement, the agency of the Holy Spirit, and the like.

*Protestantism makes the reception of a particular creed the basis of organization, but not the ground of salvation.* No Protestant denomination says to those who leave it, You are lost; the wrath of God abideth on you, simply because you have left us. But they all unite in saying, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." "He that believeth not in the Son of God shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

2. Let us now look at the creed of a State. This is a phenomenon that does not exist in our country. But wherever Church and State are united, it does exist. If the State is a Catholic State, it adopts, of course, the creed of the self-styled infallible Church; and, according to the true theory of Roman-

ism, is intolerant to all dissenters, disfranchising and executing all who refuse to adopt it. Than this, there is no worse form of the creed-power that can be developed in the future ; and like this, there is nothing in our land. Nor is there any reason to fear it. Even Romish nations have felt the necessity of abating from the severity of this system. In France, Germany and Belgium, Romish powers tolerate Protestants ; nor will it ever be possible to restore the rigors of the old system.

On the other hand, Protestant States adopt Protestant creeds, not as the condition of salvation, but as the basis of organization and public order. On such grounds, Protestant States have often been intolerant of all dissenters, in order to sustain the established church and hierarchy. This, as really as the Romish system, involves oppression and injustice. Still its theory is not to be confounded with the Romish theory, for it acts simply for national ends, and does not profess to have the keys of God's eternal kingdom. The workings of this system are always bad. It introduces an unregenerated ministry, creates a Protestant hierarchy opposed to vital godliness, tends to displace the Bible by creeds, and sometimes, as in Germany, runs through creeds into infidelity. But of this we are in no danger.

Other Protestant States, as Great Britain, have introduced the principles of toleration, and allow dissenters to spring up and react on the State Church. And, although they do not restore to dissenters all their rights, for they tax them unjustly to sustain the State Church, yet they allow them to adopt and promulgate whatever creed they please.

It cannot be denied that State creeds are always injurious and oppressive. But their power, all things considered, is not on the increase. On the other hand, the conviction is extensively gaining ground, not only in England, but in France and on the Continent at large, that the system of State Churches and creeds is evil, and ought to be abolished. The example of the Free Church of Scotland is working conviction, not only in Switzerland and France, but in the whole European world.

3. Leaving State creeds, let us now come to creeds of Protestant bodies, with an extended hierarchal organization. I use the word "hierarchal," not in an odious sense, but as applicable to all systems which deny the Congregational principle of the completeness of individual churches, for all purposes



of self-government, and which establish superior tribunals, with authority to review and reverse their decisions.

Now, generally, if not always, such systems have a denominational book and creed, besides the Bible, as their basis. So is it with the Episcopal, the Methodist, and the Presbyterian Churches. And any of these could become a State Church, so far as their organization is concerned. It is not so with the Congregational denomination. At the time of the Westminster Assembly, it was proposed to make some system which could take the place of the system of Episcopacy, which had been abolished. The Congregationalists, though urged to do it, could, on their system, devise none. The rights of particular churches would not allow it. No body could be founded, on their principles, which could be called THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF ENGLAND, with power to govern all local churches. With the Presbyterians the case was different. Their principles of church order not only allowed, but required them to subject all local churches to one great body, called the Presbyterian Church. Such hierarchal bodies feel the need of a creed and a book of discipline, as a basis of organization, and in order to produce uniformity.

Still, even such bodies have a creed on grounds not at all to be confounded with Romish grounds. They regard their creeds and books simply as essential to ecclesiastical organization and government, not to salvation.

Moreover, in the Presbyterian Church, to which you specially refer, the terms of acceptance are such, that he who receives it, is not bound to every detail of the creed. He receives it as "containing THE SYSTEM of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." But, at the same time, he is called on to declare that the Bible "is the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The Confession, Chap. I. §6, also says: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture, unto which nothing is at any time to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men." Again, chap. I. §10: "The supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and *all decrees of councils*, opinions of ancient writers, *doctrines of men*, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the

Holy Spirit, speaking in the Scripture." Again, the larger Catechism, Quest. 3, declares that "the Scriptures are THE ONLY RULE OF FAITH AND OBEDIENCE."

Hence, you are forbidden to understand the accepting act as making any thing but the Bible a rule of faith and obedience. And those who accept the creed of the Presbyterian Church are not only allowed, but required, not to accept it as a rule, any farther than it agrees with the Bible. And to discover its agreement or disagreement, they are referred to the supreme Judge, the Holy Spirit, speaking in the Scriptures.

If the matter is thus understood, there is no apostacy in requiring those who join the Presbyterian Church to accept the creed, as containing the system of doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures. It is only a mode of discovering whether there is such an agreement as to the sense of the Scripture, as to render organic action in the same body possible. A Unitarian, a Pelagian, an Arminian, could not consistently act with a Calvinist. Why should such wish to come into the same organization with them? Such could not accept the Confession of the Presbyterian Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures. I could. Not that I deem it perfectly free from errors; but it teaches the great doctrines of the entire depravity of the human race, the need of regeneration and atonement, and the agency of the three persons of the Trinity, in devising and executing the plan of salvation. And after all your protestations against the presumption involved in saying that we know what the system of the universe is, I think we do know it clearly. The present system is designed to redeem the Church, and destroy Satan. Paul tells us explicitly that God created all things to show forth his glories by the redemption of the Church.—Eph. iii., 9, 10. He tells us that the redemption of the Church, and the prostration of Satan and his hosts, shall coincide, and that then cometh the end of this system.—1 Cor., xv., 24–28. The state of the universe beyond that point, under the new system, when rebellion shall be prostrate, and God be all in all, is also presented, in the twenty-second chapter of Revelation, to the eye of faith.

The great outlines of this system for redeeming the Church, destroying Satan, and renovating the universe, are clearly set forth in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. Hence, I did not hesitate to declare, when I joined the Presbyterian church, that I



regarded it as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures. If I were asked, Do you accept the Principia of Sir Isaac Newton, as unfolding the great law of gravitation, and disclosing the system of the material universe, I would at once say, Yes: and in so doing I should not declare that I regarded the work as free from errors, or give up my right to judge of it by comparing it with the book of God's works.

Multitudes, I know well, do accept the Presbyterian Confession of Faith on such principles, and still regard and treat the Bible as being, what the Catechism declares it to be, "the only rule of faith and practice." Hence, I do not agree with you, in the assertion that liberty of opinion, even in our Presbyterian Seminaries, is a mere form. And from all that you say as to "thumb-screws of criticism," and "a choice of chains and of handcuffs," I entirely dissent. The Confession of Faith itself explicitly declares that the Bible is the ONLY rule of faith and practice, and calls on all who receive it, to test it, and all other human doctrines and decrees, by the Bible, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Let them do this, and God will deliver them from all chains and thumb-screws, and guide them into all the truth.

Still, I am free to confess, that the system of the Presbyterian Church, as to creeds, is liable to misuse, and in some respects tends to it. It has, in fact, been misused. In trials for heresy, for example, as in the case of Mr. Barnes, Mr. Duffield, and our honored father, the Confession of Faith has taken, in fact, the highest place, as the rule of trial, and the Bible has been appealed to merely in "confirmation of an exposition of the Confession of Faith." Still, this is not demanded, nay, it is forbidden, by the Confession, for the Confession declares the Bible to be "THE ONLY RULE of faith and obedience."

And farther, the common mode of referring to the Confession as "the book," shows the same tendency, unduly to exalt it. What is the meaning of the words, THE BIBLE? Is it not, *The Book*? THE BOOK of books? And shall a human composition be allowed to receive and wear that title? And is that system in all things right which tends to this result? The primitive churches had no hierarchal organization, and hence they imposed no authoritative creeds.

4. I come now to the Congregational churches without a hierarchy, and to their use of creeds. I need not say that this sys-

tem pleases me best, because here the Bible, both in theory and practice, is, in fact, "the book." These churches are abundantly willing to make known their faith. They respect and believe the confessions of the Reformers, in their great outlines. They especially regard the Westminster Confession, and also the Savoy Confession, which is, in general, the same as to doctrine.

But they do not use these as a basis of hierarchal government, or union; for there is no organized body which has power over the faith or practice of particular churches. The churches, therefore, are left to the Bible, as the rule of doctrine and discipline, and such an expression as "the book," applied to any thing but the Bible, is never heard among them. The same state of things exists in the Baptist churches, for the same reasons. Nor is there any tendency among Congregational churches to another state of things. On the other hand, the principles of Congregational freedom, and responsibility to the Bible alone, are leavening other bodies, whose organization is hierarchal.

I cannot, therefore, agree with you in your fears of an apostacy to be completed in the ruin of the churches. On the other hand, I see an increasing tendency in the Protestant world to subject all organizations, systems, and creeds, to the trial of the fiery truth of the Word of God.

Allow me, in conclusion, to make a few general remarks on the relations of belief, organization and individual liberty.

Man was, no doubt, made for individual liberty; but he was, no less, made for society. In a state of social organization, some of the purest sources of created happiness are found. Still, the freedom of the soul is of higher moment than any social interest; for the true idea of mental freedom is liberty to follow God in thought, emotion and action, and such freedom is the highest interest of the soul.

The great problem is, How to harmonize the demands of individual freedom with those of organization. This can be perfectly done only through God. There is, in the nature of things, a basis for concurrent opinion, in the spiritual world, as really as in the material system. There is one God, one law, one gospel, and if all men did but see the system as it is, they would agree. The sun enables all men to see the natural world as it is, and to see it alike. It could never be done by lamp-light. So, when God shall be on



earth the unsetting sun of his people, all will be perfectly free, and yet perfectly united in the truth. Then will the apparently conflicting claims of individual freedom, on the one hand, and of organization on the other, be perfectly harmonized. But in a state of intelligence and holiness below this standard, there will be divisions of opinion, sectarian organizations, and diverse creeds. And there is no direct way of removing this state of things. All attempts at latitudinarian comprehension are vain. If men are to think and act to any purpose, they must think and act precisely, and then let those act together who can. As knowledge, holiness and communion with God increase, grounds of division will pass away. But an assault on creeds, however fierce, can never produce this result.

You complain of the penal influence of public sentiment, on those who dissent from the common evangelical denominations. I freely admit that in a low state of sanctification, severe and unkind feelings are too often exercised towards those who dissent from the common belief. But perfect holiness, though it would remove all sinful feeling, would not create indifference to the truth. God is not indifferent to the truth. With the whole Almighty energy of his being, he loves truth and hates falsehood, and communion with him will produce the same spirit in his people. Love will produce tenderness and forbearance towards those who err from the truth, and patient efforts to win them to God. But no love can conceal the conviction that fundamental error will ruin the soul. Love of the truth admits the soul to heaven; love of a lie casts it into the lake of fire.

This sensibility to the importance of fundamental truth Satan ever aims to destroy. To preserve and increase it, is the great aim of God. It is impossible to render this otherwise than painful to the propagators of error. It would be a calamity great beyond utterance should God's Church cease to express his love of truth and hatred of error. It is her chief duty to do this. When she ceases to do it, she is no longer the salt of the earth, or the light of the world.

And when the system of the universe is finally established, never to be moved, the perfect belief, and infinite love of the truth, which exist in heaven, will react, like consuming fire, on all who love and make a lie. In great measure it will produce that lake of fire and brimstone into which they will be cast.

This punitive power of opinion and feeling takes place chiefly in the case of fundamental doctrines, such as are essential in order to convince of sin and regenerate the soul. A denial of these ruins the soul, and no holy man can be indifferent to such a denial as God has declared to be criminal. And yet this is the very state of things which multitudes desire, as essential to mental freedom. They desire an impossibility, so long as God remains as he is, and his people live in holy sympathy with him.

I know well that you do not wish to produce such a state of things. And yet those who do, find many things in your sermons which they use in their efforts to effect such a result. I deeply regret that you should have given them such an advantage, and that you have spoken, in terms of such unjustifiable severity, of the real and devoted friends of the truth.

I trust that God will enable you to disentangle the many important truths you have presented, from the erroneous or one-sided statements with which they are so unhappily connected ; and that he will guide you into the pure and perfect truth.

I am your affectionate brother, EDWARD BEECHER.

---

### MORAL COURAGE.

WE hear much said of moral courage. It is greatly admired and loudly praised. But the virtue is more talked of than practised, and the very phrase is oftener used than understood. A brief examination of its elements, with some illustrations of its practical operation, may help to rescue it from the vagueness and unimpressiveness, which are too often the results of familiarity. What, then, is Moral Courage ?

The word *courage* is derived from the French *cœur* and the Latin *cor*. The same root is found in the Greek, and in many of the modern languages. Substituting the Anglo-Saxon for the Latin element, it becomes *heartage*. It literally means heartiness ; and implies the possession of a big, strong heart. Poets often use the word "heart" to denote courage ; and in the language of common life, to "dishearten" is to discourage. Webster defines courage as "that quality which enables men to en-



counter danger and difficulties with firmness, or without fear or depression of spirits." And *moral* courage is that quality manifesting itself on moral subjects, and springing from moral considerations. It is firmness based on principle, to meet dangers and overcome difficulties, in order to resist, and if possible to conquer, moral evils. It is strength to do duty, resolution to do right. To revert to the etymology of the word, moral courage is not only a large and stout heart, but a right heart and a good one.

There is, therefore, a clear and just distinction between moral courage, and courage which is purely constitutional. Addison makes this distinction. "Courage, that grows from constitution," he says, "often forsakes a man, when he has occasion for it; courage which arises from a sense of duty, acts in a uniform manner." Constitutional courage may spring from, or consist in, excessive self-esteem, or sheer obstinacy, or powers of discernment too small to perceive real danger, or sensibilities too blunt to feel what it becomes a man to feel most keenly. It may, in fact, be mere brutal and blockish stupidity. Nay, more, to follow out the classification and the climax of Dr. Payson on another subject, it may be the very depravity of the devil. Moral courage arises from a clear perception of truth and an imperative sense of duty. In the greatest and best of men, it seems to approach to the inflexibility, not to say the immutability, of God himself. Constitutional courage is a blind propensity or passion. It fears nothing. It makes no distinction between that which is truly fearful and that which is not. It attempts, without discrimination, the practicable and the impracticable. It disregards moral distinctions. It has no reverence for sacred things. It has no dread of sin. Moral courage is an intelligent and conscientious principle. It fears what ought to be feared, and fears nothing else. As Col. Gardiner said to the man who challenged him to fight a duel, it does not fear fighting, but it does fear sinning. It does not fear man, but it trembles at the word of God.

Constitutional courage may stickle for trifles and bluster about nothing; disporting itself in the mere luxury of action and conflict. It will blow out a man's brains for a word; and that word, perhaps, chiefly offensive because it is true. It will multiply and magnify the shibboleths of party, and sect and association; and revel in the blood, or, if the times forbid that, in the property, and business, and good name of all who cannot pronounce them



with its own harshest aspirate. Moral courage rises and subsides in proportion to the magnitude and sacredness of the interests at stake. It will be yielding as water where no principle is involved; and firm as rock, immovable as the everlasting hills, in supporting essential truths and duties.

Constitutional courage is often purely physical. It is the courage of the duellist, who can stand to be shot at, but cannot bear to be called a coward. It is the courage of the warrior, who does not blench amid a shower of bullets, but who may turn pale at the gathering storm of popular indignation. Leave either of these men alone with his conscience and his God, and perchance he will start at his own shadow; perchance he will see a handwriting on the wall over against him, and his very knees will smite together. They are courageous only when they can forget duty, and conscience, and God; and drown thought, and all the higher attributes of humanity, in a tumult of excitement. Moral courage is chiefly spiritual. It would turn pale and grow faint at the very thought of fighting a duel. It might shrink from the sight of blood and the din of battle. It might well shrink from all participation in such a war as the Mexican; begun in robbery of the poor, prosecuted in bravado over the weak, and destined to end in another iniquitous annexation of territory belonging to a distracted sister republic. There is more of the hyena or the jackal, than of the lion or the man, in such courage. The man of moral courage might not dare to be seen in arms between the Nueces and the Rio Grand, still less within the acknowledged limits of Mexico, lest he provoke the displeasure of a righteous God.

But let it be needful to draw the sword in defence of the fire-side and the altar, let the liberties of his country and freedom to worship God be invaded, and he will throw away the scabbard: or, rather, with even greater fortitude, he will submit to twelve long years of imprisonment, and write the "Pilgrim's Progress" the while. Or, he will brave the power of the Stuarts, rather than pay a few shillings of ship-money illegally assessed. Or, he will incur the displeasure of king and parliament under the Georges, and hazard the death of a traitor, rather than concede the principle of taxation without representation. Or, he will stand up, like a rock amid the angry billows, and preserve the peace and independence of his country, when the majority of the people and of their representatives in Congress, blinded by popular



sympathy and revolutionary fervor, are rushing madly into the maelstrom of European warfare. He will dare to be singular; for to be singular is often the only way to be true and right in a false and wicked world. But he will also dare to be *not* singular, to be ordinary and undistinguished; for this often requires more courage, than to be peculiar and thus be prominent. He will dare to be like the many in all that is innocent, in all that is merely indifferent, whether in their measures or their manners. He will dare to go with the many just as far as they go right, though zealots reproach him with coldness and fanatics proclaim him destitute of christian piety, and radical reformers denounce him as wanting in moral courage. He will abide by the truth, whether it carry him to the throne or the scaffold; and he will also abide by it with equal steadfastness, though it leave him on the common level. He will travel towards his pole-star, whether he travel alone or with the crowd. He will bear hardship, he will face danger; alone, or with others. But he will not sacrifice any, the smallest principle.

---

## PRESIDENT QUINCY'S MISSTATEMENTS EXPOSED AND CORRECTED.

### NO. III.

HAVING said all that we proposed in vindication of Increase Mather, we proceed to perform a like service for his son and colleague in the ministry, COTTON MATHER.

This distinguished divine was born in Boston, Feb. 12th, 1662. He entered college when but twelve years old, and graduated with distinguished applause, at the age of sixteen. He seems to have been pious even from childhood, and early entered into covenant with the church. He was ordained junior pastor of the old North Church in Boston, in 1684, where he remained to the end of life.

Cotton Mather was not only an eminently devout and laborious minister, but a distinguished philanthropist. There is scarcely a department of Christian beneficence which has been thought of in our times, in which he did not attempt to accomplish something.

He wrote and published much on the subject of intemperance. He was unwearied in his efforts for the benefit of *seamen*, and of *colored persons*, of whom there were many at that time in Boston. He established a school for the instruction of Africans, of which he bore the whole expense. In face of a violent opposition, he introduced into Boston and the country, the practice of inoculation for the small pox. He published a little work entitled "Essays to do Good;"\* and his mind seems to have been continually exercised in devising ways and means of usefulness.

Cotton Mather was, by common consent, the *most learned man* in America. "No native of this country," says Dr. Chauncy, "had read so much as he, or retained more of what he read. His library was the largest, by far, of any private one on the continent." He died in the winter of 1728, when he had just completed his sixty-fifth year.

As Increase Mather was one of the Presidents of Harvard College, it was natural that the historian of the college should dwell somewhat particularly upon his life and character. But there seems no good reason why his son should hold a very conspicuous place in its history. Since, however, President Quincy has thought differently, it will be necessary to follow him, and to inquire into the justness of his representations. We begin with his objections to Cotton Mather, growing out of his connection with the subject of *witchcraft*.

There can be no doubt that Cotton Mather was a sincere and earnest believer in the reality of what in his day was denominated witchcraft; a crime which, when proved, was regarded as justly punishable with death. *This was the common faith of Christendom*, and had been so for many long centuries. It is stated by Mr. Upham, that in the seventeenth century alone, "more than two hundred were hanged in England, thousands were burned in Scotland, and larger numbers perished in various parts of Europe," for the supposed crime of witchcraft. In repeated instances, sentence of death was passed on reputed witches in England, by such men as Sir Matthew Hale, and Lord Chief-Justice Holt. Sir William Blackstone, who died no longer ago than

\* When Dr. Franklin was a boy, he read this work; and near the close of life, he said: "If I have been, as you think, a useful citizen, the public owes the advantage of it to that book."



1780, declared his belief in the following terms: "To deny the possibility, nay, the actual existence of witchcraft and sorcery, is at once flatly to contradict the revealed word of God, in various passages both of the Old and New Testament; and the thing itself, is a truth to which every nation in the world hath in its turn borne testimony, either by examples seemingly well attested, or by prohibitory laws, which at least suppose the possibility of commerce with evil spirits."

In our own country, at the time of Cotton Mather, the belief in witchcraft may be said to have been universal. Even men who had the least sympathy with the Mathers on some points, such as Thomas and William Brattle, John Leverett and Robert Calef, agreed with them as to the reality of witchcraft. In the year 1694, a paper was issued by the President and Fellows of Harvard College, and signed, among others, by Samuel Willard, John Leverett and William Brattle, inviting observation and information concerning "*apparitions, possessions, enchantments and all extraordinary things*, wherein the existence and agency of the invisible world is more sensibly demonstrated." Cotton Mather was not singular in his opinions on this subject. He would have been singular, had he not indulged them. He spoke the truth, in his reply to Calef: "I know not that I have ever advanced any opinion, in the matter of witchcraft, but what all the ministers of the Lord that I know of in the world, whether English, or Scotch, or French, or Dutch, (and I know many) are of the same opinion with me." P. 42.

President Quincy charges upon Cotton Mather, as he had done upon his father, "the responsibility of being the *chief cause*, and *promoter* of the alleged witchcrafts in New England. He had an efficient agency in *producing* and *prolonging* the excitement" on that subject. He "connected his name and fame inseparably with that excitement, as its *chief cause*, *agent*, *believer* and *justifier*." Pp. 63, 65. This is a heavy charge. Let us inquire into its truth.

We have seen that, in the days of Cotton Mather, the belief in witchcraft was *universal* in New England, as it seems to have been all over the world. He did not originate this belief, which had prevailed here from the first settlement of the country.

It must be remembered, too, that the cases of witchcraft at Salem were not regarded, at the time of their occurrence, as a *new or unheard of thing*. There had been such cases in New



England, for almost half a century before the disturbances at Salem, and before Cotton Mather was born.\* There was a notable case of supposed witchcraft in Boston, in the year 1688, in the family of a Mr. Goodwin. The offender was an old Irish woman, by the name of Glover, who was tried before Chief Justice Dudley, (afterwards Governor Dudley,) condemned and executed. This case is affirmed by the Rev. Mr. Upham, to have been "*brought about by the management*" of Cotton Mather. Lectures, p. 107. But a more unfounded accusation was never uttered. It is expressly contradicted by Mr. Goodwin, the father of the afflicted children. "Let the world be informed," says he, "that when my children had been laboring under sad circumstances from the invisible world, for about a quarter of a year, I desired the ministers of Boston and Charlestown to keep a day of prayer at my house, if so be deliverance might be obtained. Mr. Cotton Mather was the *last* of the ministers that I spoke to on that occasion: and though, by reason of some necessary business, he could not attend, yet he came to my house in the morning of that day, and tarried about half an hour, and went to prayer with us before any other minister came. *Never before this had I the least acquaintance with him.*"† How then could this case have been "brought about by the management" of Cotton Mather?

It was in February, 1692, that the strange appearances commenced in what was then called Salem Village, (now Danvers,) in the family of the Rev. Mr. Parris. But that Cotton Mather was "the chief cause" of these appearances, or exerted the slightest agency in producing them, President Quincy will find it very difficult to prove. Mr. Mather had published his "Memorable Providences relating to Witchcraft," some three years before: but that the book had ever been read in the family of Mr. Parris; or if read, that it had produced the strange appearances and sufferings of his children, there is not a particle of proof. Mr. Upham supposes that there was a connexion between the origin of this excitement,

\* There was one person convicted in Springfield, in 1645, and three others in 1655, all of whom, were executed. Between these cases at Springfield, there were one at Charlestown, one at Dorchester, and one at Cambridge: — all executed. In 1655, the date of the last executions at Springfield, there was one executed in Boston. In 1662, the year of Cotton Mather's birth, there were three executed in Hartford.

† See Reply to Calef, p. 62.



and the parochial troubles of Mr. Parris; and that the children of Parris "were acting a part." "I am constrained," he says, "to declare my belief that this dreadful transaction was *introduced*, and *driven on*, by wicked perjury and wilful malice." If this account of its origin is true, certainly Cotton Mather can no longer be regarded as its "*chief cause, promoter and agent*."

But Cotton Mather is represented by President Quincy and others, not only as the cause of the Salem witchcraft, but as greatly desiring it, and rejoicing in it. "I cannot resist the conviction," says Mr. Upham, in his lectures, "that he looked upon the Salem trials with secret pleasure." "He seems to have longed for an opportunity to signalize himself in this kind of warfare." "His boundless vanity," says Mr. Bancroft in his history, "gloried in the assault of the evil angels upon the country." Vol. iii. 85.

How do these gentlemen know that Cotton Mather *longed* for the occurrence of cases of witchcraft; and *rejoiced* in them when they appeared; and regarded their terrible and bloody results with secret pleasure?

Such a supposition is contradicted, not only by his most solemn protestations, but by the general current of his actions and life. He uniformly spoke of the spring and summer of 1692 as "a very *doleful time* unto the whole country," and of the descent of the devils upon so many of the good people of the land "as "a dreadful judgment." His son informs us, that "for a great part of the summer, he did almost every week, spend a day by himself in the exercises of a secret fast before the Lord," praying "not only for his own preservation from the malice and the power of the evil angels, but also for a good issue of the calamities in which God had permitted the evil angels to ensnare the miserable country."\* If the current of a man's life indicates the state of his heart, then Cotton Mather was truly a *benevolent* man. But how is this consistent with his longing to witness, and rejoicing in the occurrence of, what he conceived to be the most horrible of calamities and crimes?

It is further objected to him by President Quincy, that he favored the prosecutions for witchcraft, countenanced the executions by his presence, and in various ways urged on the work of blood. "In the progress of the superstitious fear, when it amounted to frenzy, and could only be satisfied with blood, he neither blenched nor

\* Life &c. p. 45.



halted, but attended the courts, watched the progress of invisible agency in the prisons, and joined the multitude in witnessing the executions." Vol. i. 64. When Mr. Burroughs was executed, it is said that Mr. Mather "rode round in the crowd on horseback, haranguing the people, and saying it was not to be wondered at that Mr. Burroughs appeared so well, for the devil often transformed himself into an angel of light."\* It is said also, that in "the advices" which the ministers presented to the magistrates in respect to witchcraft, and which were drawn up by Cotton Mather, the magistrates are urged to "the speedy and vigorous prosecution of those who have rendered themselves obnoxious."

As to Cotton Mather's "attending the courts," when the witches were tried at Salem, he and President Quincy are directly at issue. The President says he did attend. Mr. Mather affirms that he did not. "I was not present at any of them."†

As to his frequenting the prisons where the witches were confined, he may have done so, when any were confined in Boston. In the case of all prisoners, he believed this to be a part of his ministerial duty. But there is no evidence that he visited the prisoners in Salem, or was often there during the excitement.

As to his "joining the multitude in witnessing the executions," there is no evidence that this was true, except in a single instance. He was present when Mr. Burroughs was executed. He was not, as Mr. Upham represents it, "riding round in the crowd on horseback, haranguing the people;" still he was there, and sitting on a horse. For certain reasons, Mr. Mather seems to have satisfied himself that Burroughs was, on many accounts, a bad man. He believed him to be one who had intercourse with evil spirits, and who on this account, deserved to die.

In order to understand "the advices of the ministers," above referred to, the history of the connected transactions must be kept in mind. In May, 1692, a commission was issued to seven of the principal citizens and jurists of the colony, viz: Lieutenant Governor Stoughton, Major Saltonstall, Major Richards, Major Gedney, Mr. Wait Winthrop, Captain Sewall, and Mr. Sergeant, constituting them a court, to try the accused persons at Salem. The judges first assembled June 2d, and tried and condemned one, who was executed on the 10th. The court then adjourned to

\* Upham's Lectures, p. 103. † Wonders of the Invisible World, p. 81.



June 13th, in which interval, the Governor and Council asked the advice of the ministers in Boston and the vicinity, as to the course to be pursued. The ministers replied under eight particulars.\* 1. They express their sympathy with those who are "suffering by molestations from the invisible world," and "think that their condition calls for the utmost help of all persons, in their several capacities." 2. They thankfully acknowledge the success which has followed the efforts of the magistrates "to defeat the witchcrafts," and pray for a full and perfect discovery of all this mysterious wickedness. 3. They recommend "a very critical and exquisite *caution*, lest, by too much credulity for things received only upon the devil's authority, there be a door opened for a long train of miserable consequences." 4. The rulers are exhorted not to proceed, in any case, on mere presumption; and to show "an *exceeding tenderness* towards those that may be complained of, especially if they have been persons of an *unblemished reputation*." 5. The next advice is, that the primary examination of suspected persons may be without noise, company, or excitement; and that there "may be nothing used as a test, for the trial of the suspected, the lawfulness whereof may be doubted by the people of God." 6. The ministers recommend to the magistrates not to convict, or so much as commit persons, on what was called "the spectral evidence;" "inasmuch as it is an undoubted thing, that a demon may appear, even to ill purposes, in the shape of an innocent and virtuous man." They also pronounce any "alteration in the sufferers by a look or touch of the accused," to be insufficient evidence of guilt. 7. The ministers further suggest, whether an utter rejection of the testimonies commonly relied on, "whose whole force and strength is from the devils alone, may not put a period unto the progress of the dreadful calamity begun upon us, in the accusation of so many persons, whereof some, we hope, are clear of the great transgression laid to their charge." 8. Having given the above suggestions and cautions, the ministers "humbly recommend to the government, the speedy and vigorous prosecution of such as have rendered themselves obnoxious, according to the directions given in the laws of God, and the wholesome statutes of the English nation."

\* The entire paper may be found in Hutchinson's Hist. of Mass. Vol. ii. P. 62. Had we room, we would gladly insert it here.

Such was the tenor of "the advices" of the ministers of Boston and the vicinity to the magistrates. By those who are inclined to traduce the ministers of that day, and more especially to traduce Cotton Mather, by whom these advices are said to have been drawn up, the *last* article is almost the only one referred to. It is quoted as if it stood alone, without any restriction or qualification; and as if Mather and his ministerial brethren were only anxious to have the magistrates make all due despatch, and condemn and hang the suspected witches as fast as possible.

But this, it will be seen, is altogether an unjust view of the case. These advices of the ministers are to be taken and judged of, *as a whole*. And as a whole, they were manifestly designed to reprove much of the previous proceedings, and to prevent the like proceedings in future. They do, indeed, "recommend the speedy and vigorous prosecution of those who have justly rendered themselves obnoxious;" but the recommendation is accompanied with cautions, restrictions and qualifications, which, if regarded, would have prevented any further convictions. If the trials had been conducted with that "exceeding tenderness" towards the accused, which the ministers recommended; if the "spectral evidence," together with all improper tests, had been set aside; if all testimony of every kind, which rested "only on the devil's authority," had been rejected; the judges might have proceeded as vigorously as they pleased,—the more vigorously the better;—for by this means the jails had been the sooner emptied, and the accused persons had been set at liberty.

From men who believed in the reality of witchcraft, and that the witch is justly liable to death, as all these ministers most seriously did,—we see not how better advices could reasonably have been expected. Happy had it been for all concerned, if the magistrates had been content to follow them. They seem to have been fully satisfied as to the validity of the "spectral evidence," and other branches of the "devil's testimony;" and so the work of destruction went on.\*

President Quincy asserts that "after two hundred persons had

\* Mr. Thomas Brattle proves that most of those who were condemned, *suffered on the devil's testimony*. He also says that, "except Mr. Hale, Mr. Noyes, and Mr. Parris, the Rev. Elders, almost throughout the whole country, are very much dissatisfied with the decisions of the judges." See Mass. Hist. Collections, Series i. Vol. v. P. 68 — 75.



been accused, one hundred and fifty imprisoned, nineteen hanged, one pressed to death, and twenty eight condemned, one third of whom were members of the church, and more than half of good general conversation, he (Cotton Mather) wrote a formal treatise entitled 'Wonders of the Invisible World,' approving the proceedings of the courts, and exciting the multitude to a continuance in their belief, and the courts to a perseverance in their vindictiveness." Vol. i. 64. With all due respect for President Quincy, we must pronounce the charge conveyed in the latter part of the above sentence a libel; — a libel, not on Cotton Mather alone, but on Stoughton, Winthrop, Sewall, Saltonstall, and all the other members of the court. That these venerable judges, under the influence of strong delusion, committed great injustice, there is no doubt. But that they were *vindictive* in their feelings and decisions, is incredible. Judge Sewall, in his humble confession several years after, makes no acknowledgement of vindictiveness. Chief Justice Stoughton affirmed that, "when he sat in judgement, he had the fear of God before his eyes, and gave his opinion according to the best of his understanding; and although it might appear afterwards that he had been in an error, yet he saw no necessity of a public acknowledgement."\* In reference to the judges, Cotton Mather says, "Although I was always afraid of proceeding to condemn any person upon so feeble evidence as a spectral representation, *and ever protested against it, publicly and privately*, and in my letters to the judges, *besought them that they would by no means admit it*; yet, when I saw in most of the judges, a most charming instance of prudence and patience, and knew the exemplary prayer and anguish of soul wherewith they had sought the direction of Heaven above most other people, I could not but speak honorably of their persons on all occasions."† In regard to these judges, the authors of the Reply to Calef say, p. 6, "What was done by them in the dark time of our troubles from the invisible world, all honest men believe they did, *in conscience of the oath of God upon them*; and they followed, unto the best of their understanding, as we are informed, the precedents of England and Scotland, and other nations, on such a dark and doleful occasion." Thus much for the alleged vindictiveness of the judges.

\* Hutchinson's Hist. Vol. ii. P. 62.

† Amer. Biog. Vol. vi. P. 256.

The other part of the charge, viz., that Cotton Mather, in his "Wonders of the Invisible World," "approved the proceedings of the courts, and excited them to a perseverance in their vindictiveness," is equally unfounded.\* For, in the first place, he did *not* altogether "approve the proceedings of the courts:" and then if the judges were not vindictive, it is impossible that he should have "excited them to *persevere* in their vindictiveness."

That Mr. Mather did not entirely approve the proceedings of the courts, is evident from the contrariety of their proceedings in the admission of testimony, to his private letters to them, and to the advices of the ministers, which he drew up. He also tells us expressly: "I would not allow the principles that some of the judges had espoused."† In his *Magnalia*, too, Mr. Mather expresses the opinion, that the judges proceeded *too far*, and were chargeable with mistakes, particularly in respect to the kind of evidence which they admitted and on which they more or less relied. Vol. ii. P. 414.

There is another fact worthy to be mentioned here, showing that Mr. Mather did not altogether sympathize with the course pursued toward those who were thought to be bewitched. "He offered *at the first*, that if the possessed people might be scattered far asunder, he would singly provide for *six* of them; and he, with some others, would see whether, without more bitter methods, prayer and fasting would not put an end unto these heavy trials. But his offer was not accepted."‡ Had this method been taken with the sufferers, it is probable that not one of the accused had lost his life under the charge of witchcraft.

It is further urged against Cotton Mather, that, not satisfied with the tragedy at Salem, he tried to renew the same scenes in Boston; and succeeded in getting up a case of witchcraft there the following year. "To cover his confusion," says Mr. Bancroft, "he *got up* a case of witchcraft, in his own parish, in 1693."§ "He succeeded the next summer," says Mr. Upham, "in *getting up* a wonderful case of witchcraft, in the person of one Margaret Rule, a member of his congregation in Boston."||

\* The treatise referred to, was drawn up at the command of Governor Phipps, with the recommendation and thanks of the Lieutenant Governor, and with the approbation of the ministers in and near Boston.

† Life by his Son, p. 45.

‡ Ib.

§ Hist. of U. States, Vol. iii. P. 97.

|| Lectures, &c., p. 289.



That Mr. Mather had no agency in producing the strange appearances in Margaret Rule, is evident from several considerations : 1. Calef does not charge him with it, or so much as intimate it. 2. He seems to have had no acquaintance with Margaret Rule before her troubles commenced. 3. But especially is this evident from the nature of her disease. Her case, though regarded at the time as one of witchcraft, seems to have been no other than a protracted case of delirium tremens, and other mental sufferings, occasioned by the habitual use of rum. For nine days together, she swallowed little or nothing, "except an occasional spoonful of rum." When her attendants were asked, "What does she eat and drink," they answered, "She eats nothing at all, but drinks rum." No wonder she saw spectres around her, and seemed, to persons not acquainted with such symptoms, to have been bewitched. Such being the obvious explanation of her case, Mr. Mather will stand clear of having *produced* it, unless it can be shown that he persuaded her to drink the rum !

In concluding the discussion of Cotton Mather's connexion with the excitement respecting witchcraft, the following points seem to be well supported. 1. Like most of the learned men of that age, Mr. Mather was a sincere believer in the reality of witchcraft ; and that the witch, on conviction, was worthy of death. 2. He had no concern in *getting up* cases of witchcraft, in Boston, Salem, or any where else ; nor when they occurred, did he rejoice in them ; but they were to him, as to most others at that day, events of solemn and painful interest. 3. In regard to the cases at Salem, he was not in favor, at the first, of legal proceedings, but preferred that the bewitched persons should be separated, and that religious means should be used for their recovery. And when judicial proceedings had been instituted, he was opposed to the admission of the "spectral evidence," or any other evidence, which could be regarded as resting on the devil's authority. He privately wrote to the judges, beseeching them not to proceed on such evidence, and drew up cautions and restrictions, in the advices of the ministers, which, had they been duly regarded, would probably have saved the lives of all the accused. 4. Nevertheless, believing the judges to be sincerely intent on doing right, he did not think it his duty to oppose and vilify them, though he disapproved of some of their proceedings. 5. After the executions were past, at the request

of Governor Phipps, he prepared and published his "Wonders of the Invisible World," containing, with other things, an attested history of the trials of some of the principal witches.

Such, in brief, are the facts in relation to Mr. Mather's opinions and doings, with reference to the subject of witchcraft. All that is censurable in them may be resolved into the solemn belief which, in common with most at that day, he cherished, as to the reality of diabolical agency in the case.

We conclude this article with one general remark. After all the reproach which has been heaped upon our fathers for their delusion on the subject of witchcraft, two things are historically true of them: First, the results of it here were far less bloody and deplorable, than in any of the countries of Europe. And, secondly, they terminated at a much earlier period. During the Salem excitement, twenty individuals lost their lives; certainly a distressing fact to be recorded. And yet it was as nothing, in comparison with the scenes which were enacted in Europe, at or near the same period. During the seventeenth century, vast numbers were put to death in England and Ireland, for alleged witchcraft. "In Scotland," says the Edinburgh Review, "during the last forty years of the sixteenth century, the executions were not fewer than seventeen thousand." Numb. 161, p. 128. A similar but still more destructive excitement prevailed at the same time in Sweden. We are assured, also, that in the latter part of this century, (the sixteenth,) not only hundreds, but thousands, were put to death,—many of them by extreme tortures,—in Germany, France, Spain and Italy, under the imputation of witchcraft. In New England, there were no executions for witchcraft later than the year 1692; while in Great Britain, the work of death continued full thirty years longer. The last instance of the kind took place in Scotland, in 1722. There were executions for witchcraft in Bavaria, in 1749; and in one of the Swiss cantons as late as the year 1780. It is certain, therefore, and it is time for the fact to be recorded and remembered, that *Massachusetts was the first civilized Christian government to abolish the practice of execution for witchcraft.* In this, as in so many other things, that noble Commonwealth has led the way, and strode foremost in the path of reform.



## EGYPT AND THE INFIDELS.

WE propose to make a brief exhibition of the use to be derived from the monuments of Egypt, in vindication of the Bible from the attacks of Infidels, and in confirmation of its record.

We shall first vindicate the Bible from two infidel assaults. Infidelity has asserted that the state of the arts and sciences at the time when the five books of Moses claim to have been written, and the tabernacle is said to have been constructed, was not such as to admit of written records, or of a dwelling place for God's presence so magnificent and imposing as the tabernacle. Infidelity has also claimed for the world an antiquity altogether beyond what the Bible warrants; and has appealed to the *monuments of Egypt in support of its assertion*.

If either of the above assumptions were true, then the Bible is false; and immortality, so far as it rested upon revelation, is a dream. The Christian would be compelled to tear down his altar, desecrate his temple, and sink his hopes to the level of unbelief,—a life without an object, a death without a resurrection.

But are these objections sound? Were the arts in such a state as to admit of no written records, and of no tabernacle with its magnificence in the days of Moses?

Voltaire asks with his usual sneer and depth: "Where did Moses procure the paper on which the pentateuch was written, inasmuch as hieroglyphic writing only was in use, and engraving on stones, on brick, on lead, or on wood, was the only method of writing, and the Egyptians wrote in no other way?" Let the dead answer. The cities of the dead in Egypt furnish numberless rolls of papyrus, inclosed with the dead in their coffins: containing funeral rituals, with scenes descriptive of another life; and records of the laws passed by the reigning monarch, with the date of publication. Among them are manuscripts which date two centuries before the days of Moses. The happy discovery, by Dr. Young and Champollion, of the method of reading Egyptian hieroglyphics renders it certain, that there now exist in a readable form, manuscripts written in Egypt years before the age of the pentateuch. We cast back the frivolous charge made by infidelity, as utterly worthless; except as it exhibits the presumption of unbelief.



Again: Were the arts in no such condition in the days of Moses, as to admit of a structure so splendid as the tabernacle is described to have been? So saith infidelity. What is fact?

The monuments of Egypt are covered with pictures, descriptive alike of the manners and customs, the arts and sciences, the trades and religion of Egypt. We are able to determine the date by the name of the reigning monarch connected with them. The minutest details of Egyptian life are given with such particularity, that, it has been asserted, we are better acquainted with the state of Egypt under the Pharaohs contemporary with Moses, than with England under the Plantagenets.

There is proof that the Egyptians possessed the art of making glass, and of staining it in imitation of precious stones. Some of their cameos and intaglios are executed with a delicacy and perfection of workmanship which required the aid of the microscope. The edge of our best steel is turned by the hardness of their granite, which they shaped into every form of beauty and grandeur with implements of copper, tempered by a process to us unknown. They had attained to high perfection, in the working of metals, for the pictured walls exhibit gold and silver cups, goblets, urns, and vases of exquisite workmanship and tasteful forms. Their side-boards were graced with as rich a display of plate as modern luxury can boast. We have made no advance on the Egyptians in the variety or graceful forms of our articles of household furniture. You will find in the plates of Rossellini, copied from the monuments, all the details of an upholsterer's shop as it existed above three thousand years ago; with articles of furniture in every state of finish, under the hands of the workmen. The implements used in cutting and shaping the material, the gluing of the parts, the polishing and ornamenting, the gilding and furnishing with silken cushions, all are minutely detailed. The social customs and amusements of Egypt, and even the sports of boyhood, are described with wonderful life and minuteness. The gorgeous pageantry of the court, the prescribed costume, the ancient badges of office, distinguishing priest, and general, and judge, and prince, are all colored to the eye like a resurrection of the past. And these are our witnesses, that human life was not so rude and savage in the days of Moses, as to be incapable of the magnificence of the tabernacle. They existed before Moses, and have outlived him, to testify that he spake the truth.



Again, infidelity has claimed for the world, an antiquity utterly irreconcilable with the statements of the Bible. At the time that the French expedition under Napoleon was in possession of Egypt, a body of learned men who were attached to the army, had their attention drawn to a magnificent circular zodiac, in the temple at Dendera. It was detached from the ceiling, and transferred to Paris; and at once gave rise to a multitude of theories as to its origin and use. It was believed to represent the state of the heavens at some remote period; and particularly the position of the sun among the signs of the zodiac, at the time of the vernal equinox. Laborious calculations were made, to ascertain at what time the sun occupied the exact spot in the heavens indicated by the zodiac of Dendera; and the period assigned was three thousand, four thousand, and even seventeen thousand, years since. In vain Christians attempted to bring the origin of the zodiac within the limits of sober history. Infidelity exulted that it had, at last, proved Christianity false, and that its colossal power over the nations must crumble away. But the question was settled at once, by the announcement of Champollion, that he had found the names and titles of Tiberius and Domitian on the portico of the temple at Dendera, and those of Antoninus Pius and Claudius on the temple of Esneh, where existed a zodiac supposed to be two centuries older than that at Dendera. Thus these temples, with their zodiacs, belong to the times of the Roman Empire, and truth has hushed the shout of victory on infidel lips.

The monuments of Egypt afford strong confirmation of the sacred record. They establish, by independent testimony, all that is said, in the remote ages of the patriarchs, of the power and magnificence of Egypt. They furnish a reason for the language of Joseph, Gen. xlv. 34: "Every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians," — by recording the historic fact, that, previous to the days of Joseph, a numerous race of shepherds had invaded, and in part conquered Egypt; defiling the temples, prostrating the altars, persecuting the priests, and oppressing the people. After a long struggle, the native Egyptians overcame and expelled this race; but the memory of years of sacrilege and tyranny rankled into national hatred, and every shepherd became an abomination to the Egyptians.

The monuments of Egypt confirm the record of Scripture in its notice of Shishak, King of Egypt, who invaded Judea, and bore away (2 Chron. xii. 9,) the treasures of the temple and the palace, and the golden shields of Solomon. On the walls of the great temple at Karnac, this King is represented as holding by the hair of the head a number of captives, of different nations, each with the features and costume of their country. Among them are captives with Jewish features, and connected with certain hieroglyphics in an oval ring, which read: THE KINGDOM OF JUDEA. And the names of some of its captured cities occur; as Bethhoron, Megiddo, Mahanaim, and Jerusalem, under the title it still bears in the East, — the Holy City.

And stranger yet, the monuments of Egypt give "confirmation strong" of the bondage of Israel under the Pharaohs. We read, in the fifth chapter of Exodus, that Pharaoh commanded the taskmasters, saying: "Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore; let them go and gather straw for themselves. And the tale of bricks, which they did make heretofore, ye shall lay upon them; ye shall not diminish aught thereof." It was impracticable to meet the rigor of this bondage, and the tale of brick was not made good; and therefore "the officers of the children of Israel, which Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten, and demanded, Wherefore have ye not fulfilled your task?"

Thus far the Bible. Is there any thing to correspond with it in the monuments of Egypt? There is. At Thebes, on the tomb of Rekshari, an architect of Pharaoh's, you have an extended representation of the making of bricks, sunburnt, with straw, as is common in modern Egypt, at the present time. One group of the workmen is bringing, in baskets, large lumps of the mixed clay to the moulder, who passes it through a mould forming the bricks. Others have a yoke over their shoulders, with cords pendent from either end, in which the bricks are slung and borne away for use. These men have the features of Jews, and the hieroglyphics denote they are such. They read: "Captives brought by the great King to build the temple of the great God." The date belongs to the years of bondage, confirming the fact. Officers are set over them with rods, to enforce diligence and to exact the appointed task. It is a curious circumstance, that another group, with the features and dress of the Egyptian



officers, is employed with the Jews in making bricks; and it is easy to believe that they are the officers, who are compelled to make up, by their own labor, the tale of bricks which they failed to extort from the toils of the Jews. It would be no more strange that such should be fact, than that we should have all the details of an Egyptian kitchen, as it existed three thousand years ago. The picture exists; and furnishes as good an illustration of the rigor of the bondage enforced on Israel, as an artist could arrange from the text itself.

But we must close. There is much of which we have not spoken, bearing on the same great point; and doubtless there is much in illustration and confirmation of the Bible, which future researches among the monuments of Egypt will bring to light. How much, no man can say. Enough has been learned from them to impress us with the religious interest which attaches to Egypt. Her monuments have been the chosen resort of infidels. Here they have come, not to ask for truth, and wait an answer; but to torture the past into accusations against the Word of God. But the truth abides. There is, doubtless, darkness on some of the pages of the Bible; but in the progress of human knowledge, a discovery has been made, which throws light on the darkened page.

In the thoughts which have been suggested, as we have considered this subject, there is none more proper to it than the impression of the wise, though hidden methods, by which God reaches his own ends. When the king and the priest piled the masses of Egyptian architecture, and traced upon the rock the record of their times, they had no thought beyond themselves and their superstitions. But a mightier than the Pharaohs watched the structure and noted the record. After the Pharaohs, came the Greeks; and conqueror has succeeded conqueror, and all as spoilers. The storms of centuries have obscured the record; the sands of the desert have covered it; but still it lives, chiselled and painted on the stone. Infidelity exhausted the page of history and the resources of science, to destroy the authority and disprove the truth of the Scriptures. It was permitted to raise its shout of triumph, and to celebrate the downfall of Christianity and the death of man's hopes. And then, when folly had reached her most absurd development, that God, whose wisdom it is to conceal a thing, in the fitness and

fulness of time, unlocks the treasures of the past, and shows us, in part, the buried evidence of three thousand years. He had screened it from the ignorance and violence of conquerors. He had shrouded it from the curious in mysterious characters and forms. He had mantled it with the sands of the desert, or piled it up in shapeless and noble ruins; and neither the storms of heaven, nor the hand of time, could erase it. The record remained, until God made the stone to speak. He called up the priests of On, and bade the Pharaohs live again. Memnon is vocal once more, and the mummied dead speak out; and each and all bear witness that "His word is true from the beginning."

---

#### HARVARD COLLEGE.

THERE is a passage in the modern history of Harvard College which ought to be recalled to the attention of this community. A gentleman was selected some time since to fill the Professorship of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages in that College, who, a few years before his election, published certain views, which were declared, at the time, to be of infidel tendency, and which he has never recanted. We refer to Rev. George R. Noyes, D. D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages in the University at Cambridge, Mass. This gentleman also teaches as Lecturer in Sacred Literature, on the foundation by that name for the Divinity School. He also officiates in the College Chapel. The following facts will be familiar to all who recollect the history of the times when they occurred.

In the Boston Atlas of July 8, 1834, a writer, with the signature of CAIUS, published a piece entitled "Blasphemy," in which he refers to the prosecution then in suit against Abner Kneeland, editor of the Investigator, for blasphemous publications.

The writer makes a few remarks upon the constitutionality of the statute against Blasphemy, referring to a diversity of opinion with regard to it. He then calls the attention of the Attorney General to an article in the Christian Examiner, for July, 1834, with the running title "Hengstenberg's Christology." He gives the substance of the article. One extract from it will here suffice. Speaking of Psalm xvi., the writer in the Examiner says:



"But we have admitted that Peter and Paul found the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in this Psalm. Consequently we admit that they were in an error. And if so in this case, they may be in other cases where they have used the language of the Old Testament." \*

Caius concludes his strictures on this article by saying: "All that Mr. Kneeland ever wrote, or ever can write, is perfectly harmless compared with the article" from which the above extract is made.

The Atlas of the next day, July 9th, contains a reply, over the signature of A. G., understood to signify *Attorney General*, Hon. James T. Austin.

Mr. Austin observes that Caius ought to have inquired, before he published his communication, whether a prosecution, such as he calls for, could be instituted and sustained. He refers to the statute which prescribes the duties of the Attorney General, and to the proper method of commencing prosecutions, viz., by complaint to the Grand Jury. He then remarks upon the statute against Blasphemy, that it is limited in its provisions, that it goes some way towards checking indecent and obscene blasphemy; while it probably leaves some cases of what is, or, at least, approaches to, blasphemy, unprovided for.

After some further remarks of a legal character, the Attorney General proceeds to speak in substance as follows. Most of his language is here retained, in a condensed form.

"Of the piece in the Christian Examiner," he says, "no one can more regret its publication than the individual whom your correspondent invites to prosecute the author of the piece. He considers its learning very ill bestowed, its researches worse than useless, and that its tendency is to strike down one of the main pillars on which the fabric of Christianity is supported. He deprecates its effects in lessening the influence of a journal which has formerly done much in the cause of good morals and public virtue; and he fears its effect in identifying in the minds of the people, a class of men with that demoralizing and flagitious band, under whose infidel notions all the laws and decencies of society would be confounded and crushed.

"No man who wishes that the Christian system should hold its power over the great mass of the community, can wish the argument of the Examiner to be true; and many, who feel its incompleteness, may yet be unable to meet the array of learning by which it is supported. Its tendency is to shock the pious, confound the unlearned, overwhelm those who are but moderately versed in the recondite investigations of theology; and, above all, to open an arsenal, whence

\* Christian Examiner, July, 1834, Vol. xvi., P. 321.

all the small wits of the infidel army may supply themselves with arms. Its greatest evil is to disarm the power of public opinion, which was beginning to frown with severity on the disciples of Fanny Wright and Abner Kneeland, by forcing upon it distinctions which are too nice to be generally understood, and apparently to give an exemption to one class of the community, which is denied to another. It certainly disarms, to a great degree, the power of the law. Against any large and influential class in our community, the force of the criminal law is always very feeble. We see that fact in almost every class of prosecutions. In a popular government, criminal law is intended to apply to the few, and to single instances of violation; and not where the public sentiment seems to have altered or modified its provisions. If, therefore, the editors and patrons of the *Christian Examiner*, who hold a high rank and maintain a powerful influence in this community, are — as your correspondent (Caius) implies — to be confounded with infidels, scoffers and atheists; if the learning of these educated writers is no better than the depravity and ignorance of the blasphemers and revilers, whom this statute intended to restrain, and against one of whom (Kneeland) the law has already opened its battery, — the law itself, and with it society, in all its honorable forms, must crumble into dust."

The *Atlas*, of July 10, 1834, has a reply, by Caius. He waives the call on the Attorney General to prosecute; but, quoting the statute on blasphemy, and remarking on it, he concludes: "I do not express any opinion whatever on the abstract merit of the article in question: all I say is, that it is a plain and clear violation of the statute of blasphemy; and as that statute has lately been revived and put into working order, all I ask is, that it be made to work impartially."

The author of the article in the *Examiner* published a vague explanatory note, under the head of Notices and Intelligence, in the *Examiner* for Sept. 1834.

In 1840, he was made Professor at Cambridge, as already stated. By the connection of the Divinity School with the College, he is the Teacher of Sacred Literature and Biblical Criticism to the students in that school.

In this connection it will be remembered that the Rev. Dr. Palfrey, and Rev. Dr. Andrews Norton, were the immediate predecessors of Dr. Noyes as Lecturers in the Divinity School. Dr. Palfrey's lectures on the Old Testament are well known. With regard to Dr. Norton, whose writings are also well known, the following reminiscence will be in place here.

On the development of Transcendentalism in this community



by Ralph W. Emerson and others, Dr. Norton published a pamphlet, called "The latest form of Infidelity." Rev. George Ripley, one of the transcendental class, published a reply to it under the signature of Alumnus. Addressing Dr. Norton, and speaking of the graduates of that School, of which he (Mr. Ripley) is one, he says: "They have been told by the most acute and learned critics, and you, sir, are among the number, that some of the miracles related in the Bible bear the marks of falsehood on their face." After supporting his declaration by several passages from Dr. Norton's "Genuineness of the Gospel," Alumnus adds: "I leave it to a candid Christian community to judge whether such a writer is authorized to accuse his brethren of infidelity."

The proposal to dissolve the connection between the Divinity School and Harvard College, was referred, two years since, by the Overseers of the University, to a committee, of which Chief Justice Shaw was chairman. He reported that the dissolution could not legally be effected. The report was accepted. The Divinity School at Cambridge, with the author of the review of Hengstenberg's *Christology*, in the *Christian Examiner*, for its Lecturer on Sacred Literature, seems, then, to be indissolubly connected with Harvard College, and the influence of the College supports the School. Hence, the influence of the State of Massachusetts is given, through the Governor, and Council, and Senate, to the support of the Divinity School at Cambridge.

The evangelical community in Massachusetts is exceedingly tolerant. It would be difficult to point to a similar instance in this country, where the power of a commonwealth is lent to countenance a sectarian divinity school, which opposes, through its teachers, the current faith of the community. But, it is asserted, "Harvard College is not sectarian"; and it is added, "It is the only College in New England which is not sectarian!"

We do not propose to dwell at large on the thoughts and feelings which the facts already given suggest. We cannot but think that some change is at hand with regard to this institution. But we are not disposed to agitate this subject at present. We only throw out the facts which have now been mentioned, to let the community see what religious, or irreligious, influences the State of Massachusetts is made to countenance, so long as the Divinity School at Cambridge is connected with the College.

## REVIEW.

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO RELATIVES AND FRIENDS, chiefly in reply to Arguments in Support of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By MARY S. B. DANA, Author of the "Southern and Northern Harp;" "The Parted Family;" etc. Boston: James Monroe & Co. 1845. Pp. 318. 12mo.

## CONCLUSION.

WE resume our notice of these Letters, for the purpose of making some remarks upon the manner in which their author discusses the doctrine of the Trinity. We have already considered some specific points in the argument; but these observations led us away from our main design, which was, to speak of her method of investigation. Mrs. Dana tells us, that the *great* question with her, when she commenced her examination of the Scriptures, was the question of the Trinity. With this single inquiry in view, she read through the New Testament; determined, first of all, to settle the point whether to "believe in a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, or to be a believer in the absolute unity of God, and the subordinate nature of his Son."

"The question with me, then, is, Do I believe that there are three persons in one God; or, do I believe that Jehovah is one, *and one only*? Now I believe that He is strictly one, and it seems impossible that I can ever believe otherwise, when, to my mind it is plain as demonstration, that the contrary scheme involves a contradiction. I must be a Unitarian, or a Tritheist, which last I cannot be while I take the Bible for my guide. He is a Unitarian who rejects the Trinity; and, be his views of the atonement, of native depravity, of human ability or inability, what they may, still he is a *Unitarian*; he has gone over to one of the two great divisions of the Protestant world." P. 42.

Now we are free to say, that we look upon this as mere delusion. No person ever did, or can, become a Unitarian by such a process. Religion itself cannot be approached in this way. No healthy mind, inquiring what to believe, and what to do, in order to salvation, ever begins with asking what is the mode of the divine existence;—and what is possible or conceivable in this respect? This is the highest and most incomprehensible subject upon which the human mind can speculate, and the last, which our religious wants make it necessary to take up. The



practical mind ascends to God, through duty and plain revelations, and believes him to be what he is seen to be, in his works and word, regarding the mysteries of his infinite nature from afar, and contemplating them with reverence as objects of study and adoration. Man is upon the earth, and God is in heaven. By the very necessity of our condition, therefore, we must rise to the knowledge of God from beneath; we must begin with ourselves and the objects nearest us. We must make sure of the knowledge that most immediately concerns us, before we push our inquiries into subjects more remote; and most of all, before we ask what is the mode of the divine being, and what are the constituents of the infinite nature.

It is true indeed, that, in systematic divinity, we begin with God, as the first subject of study. But this is a method which has been devised in the schools. It is a method of scientific arrangement;—and should be confined, therefore, where it properly belongs, to the schools. When our purpose is, — not the arrangement and systematizing of facts and principles already known, — but to ask, What are we to believe and do that we may be saved? reason and nature both demand that we should content ourselves with knowing what we are taught to believe, and what we are commanded to do; — leaving the high problems of God's being, and purposes to be solved, if they can be, by the plain revelations and practical lessons of his Word. It is thus, that the earnest inquiring soul seeks religion; and it is thus, that God communicates it. The Bible pours the clearest and most abundant light upon our immediate duties and relationships. When we are walking in its light, we are not only in the line of duty, but of vision; and can see farthest through the vistas it opens into the being of God, and the secrets of eternity.

The great revelation of the New Testament, is the character and life of Christ. His actions and instructions, spread their light chiefly over the most familiar scenes of daily life. And for what reason has God given us the christian revelation in such simple and practical forms, if it be not that we can learn the higher and more abstract doctrines of religion only through the medium of its simple lessons and practical spirit? We can rightly apprehend such a doctrine as the Trinity, and feel the full force of its proofs, only as we reach the idea through the gospel; and see its connection with the doctrines of the atonement of Christ, and the

sanctification of the Spirit. To one who is ignorant of these things, the Trinity will have neither interest nor meaning. And to one who rejects them, it will be positively repulsive.

The truth is, that the doctrine of the Trinity is the representative of the doctrines of redemption; — it is, therefore, the index of distinctive christianity. To receive or reject it, is to receive or reject, not a single doctrine, but those associated doctrines, which have always been held to constitute the essentials of the gospel. Mrs. Dana says, that before she began that examination of the Scriptures which resulted in her rejection of the Trinity, her belief of its “collateral tenets,” had been materially modified; so that it had been a long time, since she would have been considered strictly Orthodox. Her real change of faith, therefore, had transpired before she began that course of readings to which she attributed her conversion to Unitarianism. She had really given up the doctrine of the Trinity, when she departed from those doctrines for the sake of which it had been revealed, and in which it has its true basis. Had we known her moral tendencies and sympathies, at the time she took up the evidences of that particular doctrine, we should not have doubted to what conclusion she would have come. We should have felt that the conclusion was virtually reached already.

For why, we ask, are the arguments by which the doctrine of the Trinity is supported, regarded so differently by different minds? There are men of intelligence and candor on both sides of the question. The men who give in their adherence to this doctrine, are confessedly as logical in their habits of thinking, and show as much superiority to the mere prejudices of education, as any men. And on the other hand, the objections which are brought to the doctrine of the Trinity, are, it must be allowed, sufficiently plausible to satisfy a mind, morally indisposed to receive it: while it cannot be maintained, except in blind partizanship, that they are valid enough to sway the convictions of all honest and capable minds. We are brought then to the result that it depends almost wholly upon our moral state, whether the evidences of the Trinity will satisfy us or not. And this is only a specific application of that great principle which the apostle Paul announces, that a spiritual experience is necessary to spiritual discernment. — 1. Cor. ii. 14. It seems to us that a philosophic mind, viewing simply the differences of religious opinion among men, would be

*A very easy way to evade the subject*



forced to this conclusion. The gospel is, and must be, a very different thing to him who has had deep convictions of the guilt of sin and of the need of a Saviour, from what it is to him whose spiritual experience has always been placid and self-complacent; and who consequently may desire instruction, but cannot feel the need of redemption. Now this difference in the spiritual exercises of different persons will account, as nothing else sufficiently can, for their conflicting views of Christ and his gospel.

Let us suppose an inquirer, made earnest by the waking up of his moral nature, to take up the New Testament for perusal. We will suppose that spiritual life, or its elements only, are stirring within him. He has begun to discover the hollowness and insufficiency of the world as the portion of the soul, and his heart is craving something better. With no very distinct or just apprehension, as yet, of himself as a sinner, or of Christ as a Saviour, he is discontented and unhappy. There is an aching void at heart the world cannot fill; and he asks what the will of God respecting him is, with a desire to know and do it. The first thing that strikes a person in this state of mind, as he reads the New Testament, is the lofty morality of Christ's instructions. He not only sees that Christ claims to be, but he is convinced that Christ must be, a divine teacher. The lessons he reads, his conscience approves of; he feels that they are suited to his wants. They strengthen all his better aspirations, lead him on to higher resolves, and give him a new moral consciousness. Such must be the influence, for instance, of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. As when Jesus finished that discourse, "the people were astonished at his doctrine, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes;" so will the man, whose moral nature is waking up, perceive that Jesus speaks with a wisdom and power which merely human interpreters and expounders cannot employ. He will have a witness within him, in the fitness of Christ's words to his moral nature, that he has found the truth; and that by obedience to the instruction of the great Teacher, he will find peace with his own soul and with God. If he is sincere and earnest in his inquiries, he will resolutely set himself about obedience to Christ. He will strive to bring every thought into captivity to him; and to perfect himself in conformity with the example of his great pattern.

But will he stop here? Will this be the whole of his Christian experience? If so, then we admit, that he will recognize in Christ only a teacher and an example, the last and the greatest, perhaps, of the prophets. This faith in regard to Christ, would fully meet, and answer to, his spiritual experience; and if he believed anything more in regard to him, it would lie within him as an idle and unfruitful belief. Of such a spiritual experience, such a religious belief is a fitting index. But can there be a genuine and living experience which will stop short at this point? Will a Christian who has a positive faith in Christ thus far, proceed no farther, but remain indifferent to those higher offices he sustains as a Redeemer, or reject them? This is a question of fact for the solution of which, we appeal to facts, — to the recorded and living testimony of thousands, which prove that Christians do not, and cannot stop here; and that, if any do so, it is fearful evidence of a defective experience, even in the outset; that their life is but the temporary verdure of the shallow and rocky soil; that they have but reached the threshold of the kingdom of Christ, and are all unconscious of those deep and necessary experiences, which join the soul to Christ in a true and lasting union.

Of the truth of this, we have the concurrent testimony of reason and experience. For he who truly makes Christ his teacher and example, and earnestly sets about the great work of transforming himself in heart and life into the image of Jesus, will not have made many trials before he comes to a new state of consciousness. He may at first suppose he can conform to the perfection he sees and admires in Christ. He sets out at once with strong resolves and high hopes. He determines from that moment, to break off his sins, to avert his eye and turn his ear from the solicitations of temptation; and ever after to make God, and duty, and eternal life, the controlling motives of his conduct. With these new purposes and prospects, there comes a burst of sun-light into his soul; for so full is he of confidence in his untried strength, that for him to resolve is to do, and even before the fight commences, he begins to sing of victory. But his overweening confidence betrays him. His resolutions are broken, his new aspirations die away, temptation wins an easy victory, and sin riots in the soul and insults over the fallen towers of his strength. He imputes his fall to rashness, perhaps; and makes a new beginning with soberer expectations. But new scenes of



trial await him, stronger passions kindle his soul, and brighter expectations rise before him, and he is borne off, ere he is aware, in the new current that sweeps around him. Again, and again, and yet again, is this his history. Happy will it be for him, if he do not ascribe all his previous experience to a delusive imagination, and with a cold and bitter unbelief resign himself to a course of determined sin. But if this, through the grace of God, be not his final condition, and he is brought back again to Christ and his word, he will then, if not before, become the subject of a new and deeper feeling.

We cannot meet his case, then, by pointing him to the pure and spiritual instructions of the gospel, and to the lofty and beautiful example of Christ. He will tell us, that he knows it all, and has felt it all; and that it is the very purity and loftiness of the Christian standard that discourages him; for it only shows him how entirely beyond his reach it is! He has known his duty, and has not done it! All that we may say of the divinity and blessedness of the Saviour's instructions, only deepens in his heart the sense of his guilt. For against all this has he sinned; and the appalling conviction is settling full upon his soul, that to all good he is in himself utterly hopeless! Experience has brought him now to the knowledge of his greatest want. He needs not a teacher merely, but a Redeemer. He asks to be assured that his guilt can be washed away, and that some helper will guide and sustain him in his future endeavors.

Let him now, with these convictions at heart, open the New Testament afresh; and as he reads, there will be a class of passages to which, if he read them before, he attached no special significance, but which now awaken his liveliest interest, and present to his heart just the hope and consolation he needs. He discovers, pure and holy as were the Saviour's instructions, that they did not constitute the chief end of his mission; but that all through his life he kept in view an hour for which he came into the world, and that hour was the hour of his death. The inquirer looks with wonder at the sufferings his Lord underwent in Gethsemane, and the death to which he voluntarily submitted on Calvary. He reads with delight the farewell promise of Christ to send unto his disciples "the Comforter, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father;" and as he hears his dying Redeemer exclaim upon the cross: "It is finished," a new view

of his person and office breaks upon his enraptured faith. He feels that a much greater work than that of instruction has been "finished." He believes that his teacher and example, is his Redeemer too, — that through him he is ransomed from the guilt of sin, and delivered from the reigning power of sin ; — that henceforth Christ is " of God made unto him wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." This is henceforth his hope and his rejoicing ; and his contemplation of Christ as a Redeemer is the one absorbing thought of his heart. The redemption, not alone the instruction and example of Christ, have become his song.

Now we say that one in this state of mind, — by whatever process he is brought to it, and whether we have delineated the process with any degree of correctness or not, — occupies a standpoint from which Christ and the evidences which respect his person will be seen in a new light. To one who has been led by his experience to exercise faith in Christ as a Redeemer from the guilt and dominion of sin, there will be a reason which others cannot feel or appreciate for receiving without qualification or abatement all that the Scriptures say in regard to his exalted nature. He will not be perplexed to find that, before his coming into the world, Christ was the burden of prophecy ; that the whole Mosaic dispensation, was framed as a type of him, and a preparation for his coming ; — and that, as the evangelists inform us, every event of his earthly history was a fulfilment either of the letter or the spirit of the ancient Scriptures. He rejoices to know that the only and well-beloved Son of God, sharing the nature and affections of his Father, took upon himself our nature, that he might redeem us to God, by his blood. It only confirms his faith and gives it new lustre, to read that his Saviour came from God, and went to God ; that he was glorious with his Father before the world was ; that " by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth," and " without him was not any thing made that was made ;" that He was " God manifest in the flesh," that now, in our own glorified nature, he is seated upon the throne of mediatorial empire, having " all power in heaven and on earth ;" — and that he shall yet come in the clouds of heaven, to be our judge, and to " reward every man according to his works." \*

\* Jno. 13:3; 17:5; Col. 1:16; Jno. 1:3; 1 Tim. 3:16; Matt. 28:18; 16:27.



What does it avail to say, that all these declarations admit of a secondary meaning, and *may* be applied to Christ without involving his absolute divinity? He who reads them in the grateful spirit of a redeemed soul, the very spirit in which they were written, feels no need of resorting to some other than the obvious meaning. Naturally, and with delight does he ascribe supreme glory to his Redeemer. His own heart enforces the command, that men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.

Furthermore, the Saviour promises to send the Comforter from the Father, "even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father;" and speaks of Him as a person, saying: "He will guide you into all truth; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he shall show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."\* The Christian, in reading this, will find himself naturally and unavoidably believing, that there is in the Godhead a three-fold distinction. The Father through his love for men, sends his Son into the world; the Son becomes incarnate; and the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, descends into the hearts of Christians, to comfort them, and to guide them into all truth.

Here, then, is the doctrine of the Trinity, underlying the doctrines of redemption; and growing up in the mind of the Christian, as the result of his spiritual experience. The elements of the doctrine, we believe, are to be found in every mind, whose religious exercises are of the sort we have been describing; and it will become more and more precise as these exercises become more thorough and definite. Multitudes of Christians, we doubt not, who have reflected so little upon what is contained in their belief as to be unconscious what truth lies hid in the doctrine of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, do nevertheless believe in the doctrine, and would admit it as soon as it is propounded to them. It is a doctrine which binds together the highest and most abstract truths of theology with the most vital parts of practical religion. It is the substratum which underlies the whole work of redemption: but when severed from its connections, and stated as a proposition respecting the mode of the divine existence, it is a truth the most recondite. For this reason, perhaps, the Spirit of Inspiration has not given us the doctrine in its abstract form. The word "Trinity" is no

\* Jno. 15: 26; 16: 13, 14.

where to be found in the Bible ; and as a barren truth respecting the nature of the Supreme Being, it is matter of comparatively little concern, whether it be revealed and believed, or not. But as the doctrine of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it is abundantly taught in the Scriptures ; and comes naturally and inevitably into the Christian's heart, along with his faith in the work of redemption.

We do not mean to undervalue precise and scientific statements of the doctrine. These sharp definitions and nice distinctions have been made necessary by errors as subtle ; and when they have answered their purpose by silencing the voice of objection, it will be to the believer at once a duty and a privilege, to return to the simpler and more practical statements in which the truth is conveyed by the Scriptures.

The position we have been maintaining, viz., that a Christian's experience leads naturally to a reception of the doctrine of the Trinity, — is strongly confirmed by the fact, that experimental Christians, of all communions and of all ages, have almost without exception received the doctrine. So generally has this been the case, that the Trinity has been the distinctive index of Christianity ; and in all the great revolutions and schisms of the church, this doctrine has been preserved and embosomed in the convictions and affections of practical Christians.

We might point to the two or three spots on the face of Christendom, where this doctrine is denied, in proof that theoretical speculation, and not Christian experience, is the source of doubt in regard to it ; and that disbelief of it has crept into the Churches, only when faith in Christ as a Redeemer was cold or dead.

Where a practical faith in Christ as the Mediator and Redeemer is not living in the hearts of Christians, there the doctrine of the Trinity is not likely to be retained. The vitality of the doctrine consists in its adaptation to the wants of the Christian. He who feels the evil of sin as the Bible describes it, feels that he needs such a Saviour as Christ is described to be in the unabridged language of Scripture. He has, therefore, the same kind of evidence of the truth of this doctrine, that he has of the truth of Christianity, — its adaptation to his spiritual wants. It must be confessed that the gospel is its own witness. As a matter of fact, and as a matter of necessity with the great body of mankind, the moral adaptation of the gospel to human wants is



the principal proof of its divine authorship. For how many have either the time or the ability to follow up the historical and outward proofs of divine Revelation?

There is then the same kind of evidence of this doctrine, as of the truth of Christianity. The doctrine of the Trinity will stand or fall with the doctrine of man's redemption by the blood of Christ, and sanctification by the Spirit. This doctrine will never cease to be a heart-felt verity, so long as man shall retain a consciousness of his sin and woe, and so long as he shall be baptized into the hope of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

---

### OBSERVATIONS ON MEN, BOOKS, AND THINGS.

SENSITIVE CHRISTIANS.—Some very worthy people are too sensitive to bear the exposure of what they deem to be errors, and especially if those errors are embraced by the many and the great. If we find a stray sinner, whom "nobody owns," trying to do mischief to mankind, him we may expose to just reproach. But stately and influential error, in marble pulpits or on crimson seats, must be approached with hat in hand. We see not how persons who are inclined to this timid policy, which would disband our forces in the presence of the enemy on the field, can favor the cause of missions. Will they send missionaries to China, and forbid them to meddle with organized and dignified idolatry,—with "spiritual wickedness in *high* places?"—or to Constantinople, with a caution not to disturb the settled ideas of the Mahometans?—or to the islands of the sea, with directions not to make too free with the established systems of cannibalism? Are not missionaries, as soldiers of the cross, engaged in an aggressive moral warfare? Are they not expected to assail error with vigorous efforts, and to deliver its captives from its chains? Let the over-sensitive Christian ask himself, Why the same work should not be done at home? Error leads down to darkness and to death, no less from Boston than from Canton or Smyrna, and the more strongly it is entrenched in literature, wealth, or fashion, the more is it to be dreaded for the mischief it must do. Can that be a christian spirit, which makes men more fearful of offending an erring fellow-creature, than of condemning that which is destroying him, while it is dishonoring the God of truth and his sacred cause? Is it a time for truth to be timid and tremulous, while falsehood is bold and strenuous in its work of ruin? Such was not the temper of our fathers, who nobly followed the counsel of John Davenport, the founder of New Haven, church and town: "Learn to abhor the wine of deadly error, though presented in a golden cup; and to discern Satan, though transformed into an angel of light."



THE STATE NORMAL SCHOOL AT WEST NEWTON.—This institution is becoming quite noted. It was, at one time, somewhat notorious for the manner in which its members conducted on the Sabbath. The Board of Education interposed so far as to stop the grosser and more open violations of the day, and to require the students to attend public worship at least half the usual time. Even to this, there was strong opposition: though the wonder is, that the honored and revered Board did not require attendance at the sanctuary during both parts of the Sabbath services. This is done, not only in every well regulated family in the State, but, we believe, in every academy and college, including the University at Cambridge. Perhaps, if the patrons and officers of the Normal School at West Newton shall so far succeed in their sectarian operations as to get up a new transcendental synagogue in that pleasant village, they may prove more tractable as to this particular duty.—It is said in Deuteronomy: "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man; for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord." Amid the boasted advances of our age in delicacy of sentiment and refinement of manners, this Jewish precept is become quite an obsolete notion. No wonder that Moses is no favorite with the "Normalites." And what would he, as an inspired moralist, have said to young ladies in pants, or even more indecorously garbed in the scanty guise of savages? The principal of the Normal School has brought a deep stain upon himself, through the quibbling evasions by which he has endeavored to cover up those scandalous improprieties on the part of his assistants and pupils, after having himself commended the skill of their performance. Alas! his miserable tricks in newspapers and pamphlets, to mystify the matter are not more disgraceful than the indecorum he is so anxious to hide. If this is a sample of the morality he inculcates, it is to be hoped that his disciples will make no great proficiency under his teachings in that branch.—There is one peculiarity in the internal management of this seminary which ought to be known to the parents and friends of all who are proposing to enter its walls. Each pupil has been, and we suppose still is, required to keep a journal of daily occurrences, and of her feelings in relation to them. These journals are statedly submitted to the inspection of the teachers. This is done under the pretence of ascertaining what is the "public sentiment" of the school: but it is a reposing of confidence which judicious parents would wish a daughter to make with few beside themselves. This measure goes beyond auricular confession; and is even more adapted than that grand engine of popish despotism, to produce enslavement of mind. The conductors of this school, paid by the Commonwealth, are of that class who follow the transcendentalism of Emerson, Ripley and Parker, which has been solemnly pronounced, even by Cambridge professors, to be "the latest form of infidelity." Of course, it is not strange that there should be in usual attendance among its sixty or eighty pupils, but very few members of evangelical churches. Mr. Mann tells us that three-fourths of all the teachers in our district schools are orthodox. A proportion which he may soon see greatly diminished, as fast as this hot-bed of "the latest form of infidelity" shall supply a new set fully imbued with the juices of that poison-plant. School committees will do well to look to this matter.



LIVES OF THE CHIEF FATHERS OF NEW ENGLAND.—The third volume of this series, containing the life of John Eliot, by Rev. N. Adams, has just appeared. It is supposed by many, because this series is prepared at the instance of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, that it belongs to the class of juvenile books. This, however, is a mistake. There are few works which are more elaborately prepared, or enter so deeply into the early history of our remarkable country. The volume before us delineates, at full length and size, one whose portrait has been drawn often and well on a lesser scale. It is sketched, too, by an artist who deals in none but the hues of truth, and who is capable of doing justice to the character he so deeply admires. It is a sketch of our early Indian missions. In this view, it is an historical painting, in which the Roxbury patriarch is the principal figure, occupying the foreground; while the rest of the canvass is filled by the dusky figures of the ancient lords of the soil, who crowd the scene with the details of their lot, where only the sunlight of the gospel relieves the prevailing gloom. It depicts the evangelical zeal of our fathers; and we hail it in the words of Coleridge: "I have always been an obstinate hoper; and even this is a symptom of hope to me, that a better, an ancestral spirit is forming, and will appear in the rising generation."

THE LIBERATOR. — We were thinking the other day, how long it was since we had thought any thing of the Liberator. We called to mind the influence it once exerted in the religious community; how much the good people were distressed by its earlier aberrations; how laboriously they strove to reclaim it by the array of facts and arguments; how pathetically they exhorted its conductors to return from the error of their ways. Such was once the case. But now the orthodox churches have lost their interest in it, and have ceased to grieve about its course. It has completely lost all hold upon them. It cannot move them. It cannot touch them. Many are ignorant whether or not it is still published. In its wild wanderings, it has completely separated itself from all sympathy, retaining no points of contact through which it might influence them. Moved by these reflections, we sent for a late number of the paper, to see whether it had changed from what it was some six or seven years ago. We found that it retained its stereotyped character. It reeked with the same stale bitterness, and foamed with the same cold froth as of old. The country, the church, the ministry, the Sabbath and the Bible, were hacked at with the same hacknied weapons as ever. The history of this paper is an instructive example of the folly of such would-be-reformers as are impelled not by religion, but by will, which is the want of it. They open their batteries so far out of the range of the strong-holds of slavery, that the shells fall short, and explode in the camp of those who have always been opposers of that hated institution. Their shot have done incomparably more damage at home than they have dealt upon the foe. Meanwhile the "slaveholder" laughs as he looks at the moral contest waging at the North, while he goes to literal war with Mexico, and with our help wins half a continent to widen his domain. O, sagacious reformers, what wonders ye have wrought!



UNITARIAN PERIODICALS.—Literature of this kind finds great favor with the Unitarian denomination. In addition to what is contributed to the support of works of a more general character, they sustain in this city several publications devoted to their religious views. Of these, the first in all respects, is the "Christian Examiner," published every two months. It always has some good reading, but is pervaded by an intense aversion to orthodox truth, and to the plenary inspiration of the Bible. Full well do its conductors know that if the Bible be accepted as the living word out of God's mouth, its oracles will utterly condemn them. This infallible rule, however erroneously it may be applied by fallible men, cannot square with their doctrine. Their only defence is, to deny its infallibility; and to assert that a great part, no one knows how much, of the sacred volume consists of obsolete matters, antiquated prejudices, innumerable contradictions in matters of fact, fraudulent interpolations and corruptions of the text, and inaccuracies of memory and statement on the part of its writers. This hideous array of imperfections, which, though they may not intend it, must destroy all settled confidence in the authority of the Scriptures as a *perfect* rule of faith, is necessary to their defence. Without it, there is no getting away from those countless orthodox proof-texts. They must lose the day, unless they can make this trump of God to "give an uncertain sound." When we read the essays of the "Examiner," on these topics, we can easily understand what so much perplexed the amiable and learned Dr. Taylor, who was a zealous Socinian, and theological tutor at Warrington, who used to express his surprise, "How it happened that most of his pupils turned deists." In our day, they would have done the same thing under another name. Next to the "Examiner" is the "Religious Magazine," which is issued monthly. Its chief characteristic is dullness. But as the editor, in sober sadness, owns this to be the case, as appears by a recent number, it would be ungenerous to say any thing more about it. No doubt, there are many who relish it on this account, and love to fatten their own dullness on its rank, narcotic weeds. Then comes the "Unitarian," printed monthly, and occupied with matter extracted from Unitarian publications in England. From this work, it is made manifest that the English Unitarians are but "weak brethren" in comparison with the American branch of the family, feeble as this last is too often found to be.

The existence of these publications is one great proof of the necessity of one more, which shall, in this city, zealously guard the gospel against the open attacks and secret underminings by which it is threatened, not only from these, but from numerous other hostile forces. It is the gospel of peace and love, which, with all its fervent gentleness and intense charity, exhorts us that we "should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

THE CAUSES AND THE CURE OF PUSEYISM.—While there is so much Puseyism abroad, it is no more than right that there should be a little Puritanism as a counterpoise. It has been a matter of surprise, that the strong mass-movement toward Rome has not produced a decided reaction in favor of the principles of those great fathers of New



England who boasted that they placed their ecclesiastical institutions "the nearest to the Bible and the farthest from Rome, of any Church in the world." The Romanizing tendency in a large portion of the Episcopal communion has called forth the book whose title stands at the head of this paragraph. The Author was once editor of the "Monthly Episcopal Observer," and is still, as he insists, a zealous Episcopalian. He ascribes Puseyism to those relics of popish worship and feeling which were retained in the Church of England at her first incomplete reformation under Henry VIII. This leaven was never thoroughly purged out, and is now spreading itself through the mass. When "bloody Bonner," the bishop of London and chief instrument of the cruelties of Queen Mary, saw that these remnants of the old superstition were retained, he cried with coarse exultation: "If they sup of our broth, they will soon eat of our beef." This prediction of his seems to be verified in our Puseyites, who are greedily gnawing the old popish marrow-bones so long sodden in the cauldron. As the "cure," Mr. Warren advises that the reformation of his church be made complete by purging its liturgy and usages of these offensive scraps of the dark ages. This proposition seems to us so reasonable and righteous, that we cannot but wonder that the many excellent ministers and members of his church do not receive it with favor; and that so many, even of the best of them, manifest the deepest displeasure thereat. But in a cause so just, he does not stand alone. He could not have proceeded thus far, but by special assistance and support from the great Author and Vindicator of truth. As the Puritans used to say: "It is better to please one God, than many men."

THE CHURCH MEMBER'S MANUAL. — Considering the immense numbers of the Baptist denomination, it is singular that this book, by Rev. William Crowell, should be the first attempt to exhibit their ecclesiastical system in a complete form. That the want of such a book has not been so felt as to call it into existence before, is owing to the fact that the Baptist churches are essentially Congregational in their discipline. The English and American churches of the Baptist order originated in secessions from the Congregationalists, and naturally took with them those ecclesiastical usages to which they had been accustomed. These usages are so simple and complete, as scarce to require any guide but plain common sense enlightened by the Bible. Every local church takes care of itself; and minds its own business, without interfering unasked in the concerns of its sister churches. Hence, under this government, you can burn down only one house at a time; instead of endangering a general conflagration in every case of fire, as is apt to be the result when disputes are carried up by appeal from the church where they began, to be decided by Conventions, Conferences, Synods, and other hierarchal combinations. The work before us is well executed by an able man, with very able advisers and assistants. It would answer as a manual of discipline for Congregationalists in general, but for some feeble arguments against infant-baptism, and in support of exclusive immersion and close communion. These, we suppose, were inserted, partly to give the work a sort of Baptist air and tone, and partly to sweeten it for the lips of those for whose use it was



chiefly designed. So far as the orthodox churches have any occasion for a work of the kind, their wants are amply met in the "View of Congregationalism," by Rev. George Punchard, who has treated the subject in a most thorough and satisfactory manner.

COMMUNITISM. — Setting aside the grossly immoral doctrines of Fourier as to the domestic relations, doctrines utterly rebellious against the institutions of God, and subversive of the sacredness and beauty of the family state, we consider his scheme as wholly impracticable. It is framed wholly after the model of visionary speculation; and not after the facts of human nature, to which it has no sort of fitness. The community of goods which existed for a short time among the primitive disciples, was but a voluntary effort of their zeal to meet a temporary emergency in the first stage of the great reform they were commencing. The destruction of individuality, and of individual interest, was no part of the plan of Christianity. Our religion never contemplated the grinding up of mankind into a uniform mass, like the clay in a brick-yard, and then to reproduce the same number of persons turned out of a mould, all of the same dimensions. It is obviously the will of God that inequalities should exist every where, and be made subservient to the promotion of the general good, to a degree which can never be effected by reducing all things to a dead level, with its weary and listless sameness. Were there no millionaires, the number of men who would so far succeed in their strivings as to secure a competency would be sadly diminished. The experiment of a community of goods was never tried under more favorable circumstances than by the planters of the Plymouth Colony. They were a band of men of pre-eminent vigor of purpose, and intensely conscientious in carrying out, at every cost, the pious design which brought them to these shores. Their agreement with the Plymouth Company in England obliged them to labor in common, and to put the fruit of their labor into the public store. Under this method they repeatedly suffered the direst extremity, till Governor Bradford obtained for them a release from the restraints upon individual acquisition. Under the stimulus of this change, the colony felt the impulse of hope and the prospect of reward, and never after felt want or dependence. The community plan, which failed in such hands as those of the Pilgrims, can never succeed in the clutches of brutal Owenites and heartless infidels. The late Dr. Wisner was thought "not to have an idle bone in his body:" but his observation of the world led him to say, that "mankind is not only totally depraved, but totally lazy." Men need the spur of interest to urge them on in the race of exertion without which there is no reaching the goal of perfection. Let society be reconstructed on the socialist plan, if that were possible, and every man, feeling that no endeavor of his could either better or worsen his condition, or redound in any way to the benefit of his offspring, would sink down in apathy, and rot in his stagnation. The main spring of action would be broken. The sinews of effort would be cut. And humanity, run down to brutishness, would waste away on the fenceless field of savagery.